United Nations A/66/301

General Assembly

Distr.: General
12 August 2011

Original: English

**Sixty-sixth session**
Agenda item 19 (c) of the provisional agenda*
**Sustainable development: International Strategy for Disaster Reduction**

# Implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

## Report of the Secretary-General

*Summary*

The present report provides an overview of progress on the implementation of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction in response to General Assembly resolution 65/157. Disaster risk is accumulating faster than economic growth, thus hampering development and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The midterm review of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters revealed that its principles have guided progress towards resilience. However, risk management systems and decision-making at national, subnational and international levels require further critical development, including disaster loss accounting and integrated risk modelling, to support sound development and investment planning.

The third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, held in May 2011, convened the broadest-ever cross-section of leaders and experts committed to building resilience. Its deliberations provided guidance for the further implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. A strong sense of urgency for increased investments in disaster risk reduction was expressed. The Government of Japan offered to host the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in 2015.

* A/66/150.

11-45296 (E) 120911

Please recycle

# Contents


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Trends in disasters and disaster risks | 3 |
| II. | Challenges and opportunities associated with the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action | 4 |
| III. | Coordination and guidance through the Strategy system | 6 |
| | A. Strengthening global, regional and national level coordination | 7 |
| | B. Advocating for safer cities, schools and hospitals | 10 |
| | C. Increasing investment in disaster risk reduction | 11 |
| IV. | Conclusions and recommendations | 12 |
| Annex | | |
| | Specific information on progress made in implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action | 15 |

# I. Trends in disasters and disaster risks

1. Large and small disasters, ranging from the Pakistan floods in July 2010 to floods in countries such as Benin or Brazil, are a further demonstration of the intimate relationship between disasters and poverty, as highlighted by the *2011 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction: Revealing Risk, Redefining Development*.[1] Meanwhile, the floods in Australia, the earthquake in Christchurch, New Zealand, and the earthquake, tsunami and nuclear disasters wreaking havoc in north-eastern Japan are stark reminders that developed countries and their economies are also exposed and cities are at risk. Hundreds of smaller disasters associated with climate variability have caused enormous damage in many countries, revealing how risk is linked to unsound development practices and growth in economic and population exposure.

2. The increasing financial, social and political cost of disasters is evident. Mortality risk associated with weather-related hazards is declining at the global level, while economic losses continue to increase across all regions. According to the *2011 Global Assessment Report*, mortality risk related to tropical cyclones has decreased by 50 per cent in East Asia and the Pacific since 1990. Concerning earthquake and tsunami risk, both mortality and economic loss risk are rising globally. During the reporting period, a total of 347 disasters triggered by natural hazards affected more than 255 million people, claiming more than 106,000 lives and causing economic losses of over US$ 304 billion.[2]

3. Economic loss risk is growing faster in higher-income countries. Since 1980, economic loss related to tropical cyclones increased by 262 per cent in high-income countries, compared to 155 per cent in low-income countries. In 2010, the economic loss risk related to floods in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries was about 170 per cent more than in 1990, rising faster than gross domestic product (GDP). Economic risk related to floods and tropical cyclones is indeed increasing faster than GDP per capita in many countries, meaning that the risk of losing wealth in a disaster is increasing faster than wealth is being created. Low-income countries have less capacity to absorb and recover from economic losses owing to disasters. In general, larger economies are more able to absorb losses than smaller ones — such as small island developing States — because they tend to be more geographically and economically diverse.

4. Drought is the "disaster" that is most associated with inappropriate social and economic policy choices, and often with the instability caused by conflict. It remains a hidden risk, poorly understood despite its impacts on human health, livelihoods and multiple economic sectors. Drought leads to stress and insecurity for rural and pastoralist populations. Disaster data reported nationally and internationally fail to capture the extent of drought impacts. For example, only four drought-related deaths were reported globally between July 2010 and June 2011, while 32,482,102 people were reported affected by droughts — more than by any other hazard.[2] Strengthened integrated risk management systems at local and national levels, with systematic recording of drought impacts, is a key step required

[1] The *2011 Global Assessment Report* is a collaborative effort of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction system partners. See www.preventionweb.net/gar.

[2] EM-DAT: the OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database.

to reduce drought risks, improve early warning and prevent drought impacts from cascading into food security crises.

5. In the period 1970-2010, the world population increased by 87 per cent. During the same period, the population growth in flood-prone river basins increased by 114 per cent, and in cyclone-prone coastlines by 195 per cent. Hence, economic and productive assets are accumulating in the most hazard-exposed areas, particularly in low- and lower-middle-income countries. To reverse these trends, development plans and investment choices must be informed by risk information and addressed through an applied disaster risk reduction framework.

6. Natural hazards, as illustrated by the Great East Japan Earthquake and tsunami, can have devastating sequential and collateral impact — not only for nuclear facilities, but also for infrastructural complexes such as hydropower dams, industry, bridges and highways. These considerations must motivate new efforts for integrated, over-the-horizon thinking and planning for design standards, preparedness, early warning and response.

## II. Challenges and opportunities associated with the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action

7. The midterm review of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters,[3] the HFA Monitor,[4] the *2011 Global Assessment Report*, the global and regional platforms and associated consultative processes have identified critical challenges, opportunities and priorities to reduce risk exposure and vulnerability. There is a solidly growing political will to manage disaster risk at global, national and local levels as well as across the public and private sectors. It is now critical to channel this determination through clearer guidance on "how-to-do-it" through evidence-based decisions, informed public opinion and increased cooperation across business areas and global, national and local levels.

8. In line with General Assembly resolution 64/200, the Strategy secretariat facilitated the midterm review of the Hyogo Framework for Action through a participatory approach involving stakeholders at international, regional and national levels.

9. The midterm review highlighted that the Hyogo Framework for Action over the past five years had significantly contributed to generate international and national political momentum and action to reduce disaster risk. Its principles have been widely adopted as guidance. The review indicated critical areas for further work and cooperation.

10. The review confirmed that reduction of disaster risk, exposure and vulnerability primarily depend on sound development policies and investments. Whereas there are some good examples of how this can be done, a full integration of risk management in development planning is still lacking and this is attributable to, among other causes, the limited engagement of communities and local governments as well as the lack of a whole-of-government approach in the determination of national priorities.

[3] A/CONF.206/6 and Corr.1, chap. I, resolution 2. See www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-mtr/.

[4] www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/hfa-monitoring/.

11. Managing disaster risk and its consequences requires strong cooperation across sectors and among nations, including local constituencies. While there is progress in certain sectors, this cannot yet yield the expected results given the lack of integration of systems. Significant knowledge has been generated but is not fully used. The public and the private sectors have developed important practices and have important lessons to share. It is therefore critical to review existing disaster risk management systems and their interfaces both at national and international levels. In this context, national-level, multi-stakeholder "national platforms for disaster risk reduction" have represented an important model and potential source for guidance for informed decision-making and public awareness. However, their potential has not been fully utilized and there is a need to further review how can they best support domestic decision-making and international cooperation.

12. Accountability for effective disaster management requires further strengthening. The adoption of relevant legislation by numerous countries is a significant step. At the same time, it cannot yet be effectively implemented owing to the lack of appropriate recording of disaster losses, as well as the lack of clear standards, baselines and target indicators to guide and measure progress. In this context, the development of guidance tools based on cross-sectoral knowledge and experience is critical. Common analytical tools to trace and understand the causes of disasters would support development investment and planning, as well as prepare for future hazards. Whereas risk is local in nature, its reduction requires national and global cooperation.

13. Evidence has emerged that effective disaster risk management is dependent on the existence of a senior, over-arching authority at a high governmental level where both responsibility and accountability rest for setting policies, leading whole-of-government processes, and ensuring budget allocations for all the different aspects of disaster risk reduction. The *2011 Global Assessment Report* concluded that at the central government level, responsibility for disaster risk management needs to be located in a ministry or department with planning oversight and fiscal responsibility that can provide political authority and policy coherence across sectors. The incremental decentralization of responsibilities to local governments needs to be accompanied by a decentralization of capacities and resources. Disaster risk management will be effective only when it is carried out in partnership with disaster-prone households and communities, and their organizations. This is key to cost-effectiveness, sustainability, citizenship and social cohesion. There are a growing number of examples of such partnerships, but in many countries this implies a change in the culture of public administration. The challenge is not community participation — it is government participation in the planning and implementation of community and local disaster risk management.

14. While a number of mechanisms for generating and sharing information are in place, standards for disaster risk reduction remain varied, unintegrated or do not address management of multiple hazards that occur simultaneously or sequentially. A multi-hazard approach for preparedness that factors in techno.ogical disasters as secondary effects of natural disasters is necessary.

15. The midterm review of the Hyogo Framework for Action noted that financing of disaster risk reduction is still underdeveloped and more work is needed to track investments, positively condition development investments and support local level action. In this context, the Strategy secretariat has engaged a number of countries and organizations for the development of models and guidance.

16. According to the *2011 Global Assessment Report*, most countries are not systematically accounting for losses in public assets owing to disasters. Unaccounted losses are often absorbed by low-income groups, increasing poverty and eroding progress towards the Millennium Development Goals. At the same time, when these losses in public assets are monetized they often represent a significant proportion of GDP or national budgets. Most countries are unable to quantify their investments in disaster risk reduction but when they do, those investments are rarely commensurate with the scale of the losses. Unless the costs of those losses are calculated, it is unlikely that a country would be able to justify increased investments in disaster risk management in the national budget. The *2011 Global Assessment Report* further concludes that land-use planning and building improvement to avoid creating risk has benefit-cost ratios of 4 or more, whereas correcting risk through relocation or retrofitting is only just cost-effective. Given that public investment typically represents 3 to 15 per cent of GDP, incorporating disaster risk reduction into public investment planning is a strategic decision which could lead to a significant reduction in risk in the medium term. Countries such as Costa Rica and Peru have included disaster risk in their criteria for the evaluation of public investment. The most cost-effective risk reduction investments are those concentrated in the most vulnerable part of a country's portfolio of public buildings and critical facilities. Existing social protection instruments can be adapted to reach out to millions at relatively low additional cost. For example, Chile extended payments from its social assistance programmes to households affected by the February 2010 earthquake and tsunami.

17. Disaster risk information plays a critical role in guiding investment decisions and supporting public opinion. Access to information about natural hazards and the available risk reduction measures provides opportunities to reduce vulnerabilities. Risk information in the immediate aftermath of disasters is vital to an effective response and can guide the immediate actions of relief and response teams, national and local government and the general public. A complex question that requires careful and collective consideration is the criteria for the determination of the level of risk and the cost of the mitigating measures that governments, organizations and communities are ready to take when considering the impact of extreme events.

18. In December 2010, at the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Cancún, Parties asserted the importance of enhancing climate change-related disaster risk reduction strategies, taking into consideration the Hyogo Framework for Action where appropriate. The attention to disaster risk reduction in the Cancún Adaptation Framework signals strong national ownership of disaster risk reduction, and the established processes for formulating and implementing national adaptation plans present an influential means of scaling up disaster risk reduction through multisectoral, multi-stakeholder processes.

## III. Coordination and guidance through the Strategy system

19. Effective disaster risk reduction requires innovative and cross-sector partnerships, including at the local level and between public and private entities. The existing mechanisms at global, regional and national levels have proved to be critical for creating political momentum and space for disaster risk reduction. There is a need to further strengthen those mechanisms and to ensure their interconnectedness and the

inclusiveness of various stakeholders to address the emerging challenges related to climate and disaster risk reduction.

## A. Strengthening global, regional and national level coordination

### Global

20. The third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction was held in Geneva from 8 to 13 May 2011. It brought together over 2,600 delegates representing 168 Governments, 25 intergovernmental organizations, 65 non-governmental organizations, the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, local governments, parliamentarians, the private sector, academic institutions, civil society and international organizations. The third session was chaired by my Deputy Secretary-General in consideration of the fact that disaster risk reduction is at the centre of the development, environmental and humanitarian work of the United Nations and its partners.

21. At the third session, the Global Platform and its preparatory, participatory process were confirmed to be the main forum at the global level for policy guidance, coordination and partnership development, and cross-sector fertilization for the sharing of good practice on disaster risk reduction. The Geneva-based International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Support Group, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations, partners and local governments in the "Making Cities Resilient" campaign, the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Private Sector Advisory Group, and regional organizations as well as the United Nations agencies and the World Bank, provided critical inputs for the preparation of the third session.

22. In addition to statements of commitments by Member States, mayors advanced their commitment to the Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient; private sector participants agreed on Five Essentials for Business; a group of young people came together to advance a five-point charter on children and disaster reduction; and a joint statement from international organizations focusing on health called for scaling up the community-based health workforce as vital for disaster risk reduction, and called for Governments and partners to invest for strengthening their capacity. Regional organizations reaffirmed their commitment to implementing regional strategies agreed to in ministerial meetings worldwide.

23. The Hyogo Framework for Action has a lifespan from 2005 to 2015. Discussions at the third session stressed the importance of ensuring the further implementation of the Framework, while discussions concerning the post-2015 disaster risk reduction framework unfold, facilitated by the Strategy secretariat as the focal point in the United Nations system for disaster risk reduction. In this context, during the third session, the Government of Japan made an offer to host the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in 2015 to coincide with the expiration of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.

24. An integral component of the third session of the Global Platform, the first World Reconstruction Conference, organized by the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, the World Bank and the Strategy secretariat, recognized challenges in the coordination and financing of post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. Discussions focused on how to develop an effective recovery

framework, more reliable financing and knowledge practice, stressing the integration of risk reduction into all post-disaster actions.

25. Member States demonstrated a growing commitment to disaster risk reduction and widening the necessary political space for discussions and actions. On 9 February 2011, the President of the United Nations General Assembly convened an informal thematic debate on disaster risk reduction with the aim of strengthening the understanding of how to reduce risk and exposure to disasters through effective investment policies and practices and sustainable urban management.

26. The HFA Monitor is a valuable source of information for monitoring progress on the Hyogo Framework principles, sharing of practices and identifying emerging strategic issues to address nationally and internationally. A total of 133 countries contributed to the third reporting cycle 2009-2011. A further refinement of this tool is under way, including a module for self-assessment at the local level.

**Regional**

27. Regional activities were significant over the reporting period.[5] The Strategy secretariat's substantive advice and support provided to governments and regional organizations in the preparation of regional Ministerial conferences, regional platforms and other meetings, with resulting action plans and follow-up activities, are valued by stakeholders.

28. Regional meetings identified the need to decentralize and implement local and community-based disaster risk reduction strategies and programmes, through adequate, realistic and predictable funding mechanisms and with an enhanced role for local governments and local non-governmental organizations, including volunteer networks. Moreover, discussions and communiqués reiterated commitment to the provisions of the Hyogo Framework as guiding principles for disaster risk reduction.

**National**

29. At the national level, national platforms for disaster risk reduction or similar national coordination mechanisms have the potential to support decision-making concerning national development plans and investments. During the third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, a meeting of national platforms discussed options and best practices to improve their action. The Strategy secretariat will further support reviews of the current practices and promote enhanced multi-stakeholder disaster risk reduction capacities.

30. United Nations Resident Coordinators are increasingly engaged in disaster risk reduction in high-risk countries as the needs and demands become more explicit. The Strategy secretariat, together with partners, has contributed towards the integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation objectives in 30 United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks.

31. Mobilizing specific stakeholder groups and "agents of change" has led to a considerable increase in the political profile of disaster risk reduction. Mayors, governors and parliamentarians advocated with the Strategy secretariat among their peers for increased commitments and actions to build resilience. The United Nations

[5] Strategy secretariat, *Aligning Regional and Global Disaster Risk Reduction Agendas: Summary of key regional political commitments and disaster risk reduction priorities* (May, 2011).

Sasakawa Award for Disaster Reduction 2011 targeted resilient cities and local action, with North Vancouver (Canada), Santa Fe (Argentina) and San Francisco (Philippines) sharing the award, while Bhubaneswar (India), the Centro de Coordinación para la Prevención de los Desastres Naturales en América Central (CEPREDENAC) (Central America) and the Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority (Pakistan) received certificates of distinction.

32. Most recently, the Strategy secretariat established the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction Private Sector Advisory Group. It acts as a catalyst, bringing together a wide range of private sector entities into a global partnership in order to build resilience through specific actions, such as supporting national and local risk assessments, promoting social and environmental sustainability in risk financing, fostering dissemination of data, and leveraging sectoral private sector expertise and strengths, for instance, in construction of resilient infrastructure and sustainable land use and development in high-risk areas, such as cities and coastal zones.

33. The work with parliamentarians, the Inter-Parliamentary Union and national assemblies has led to increased political commitment to invest in disaster risk reduction and climate risk adaptation at global, regional and national levels. In addition, the Strategy secretariat advocated gender-sensitive disaster reduction by promoting the shared ownership and leadership of individual and institutional partners.

34. Under the leadership of my Special Representative for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Strategy secretariat continued to play a leading role in providing coordination and ensuring synergy through the above-mentioned global, regional and national mechanisms, in leveraging International Strategy for Disaster Reduction stakeholders' vision, and knowledge generation and knowledge-sharing, fostering new partnerships and advocating for more resilient communities. The uniqueness of its cross-cutting mandate has allowed the Strategy secretariat to bring together partners from the development, environmental and relief communities to charter the next steps for the further implementation of the Hyogo Framework.

35. The midterm review of the Hyogo Framework for Action and the *2011 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction* have brought to the fore the need to strengthen governance mechanisms at all levels in order to ensure effective disaster risk reduction, including within the United Nations system. In particular, it has highlighted the need for the United Nations system to strengthen its policy and operational coherence to better support countries through the United Nations Resident Coordinators and the United Nations country teams. I asked my Special Representative to brief the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination on the findings of the review and to propose a future course of action. The High-level Committee on Programmes will discuss the matter further in order to determine the appropriate course of action across the United Nations system. The Strategy secretariat will continue to focus on enhancing coordination within the United Nations system.

36. On multiple occasions, partners and governments have reiterated the Strategy secretariat's critical role in the strengthening of the United Nations system's work for disaster risk reduction. Based on the appreciation expressed by the review, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) in its audit report of 28 July 2010 on the governance of the Strategy secretariat, as well as General Assembly resolution 65/157, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions concurred with my proposal to extend the post of the Special Representative for

Disaster Risk Reduction for another four years until the end of 2015 to ensure the follow-up to the midterm review, further implementation of the Hyogo Framework, and to facilitate the development of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. I will also look into other measures to ensure that the Strategy secretariat can discharge its mandate with efficiency and effectiveness.

## B. Advocating for safer cities, schools and hospitals

37. Half of humanity is now living in cities. By 2050, urbanization will rise to 70 per cent and urban risk will continue to increase. The Strategy secretariat worked to raise the profile of local governments' work in reducing disaster risk and building resilience by targeting mayors and city councils, through the world disaster risk reduction campaign "Making Cities Resilient: My city is getting ready", launched in 2010, which is boosting efforts to develop and implement local resilience strategies. In less than a year, at the end of June 2011, more than 750 cities and local governments had signed up in the campaign, which has accrued a host of enthusiastic supporters from across the global and national city networks, the United Nations system, civil society and the private sector. A growing number of city-to-city collaboration efforts and similar initiatives on disaster risk reduction are emerging as a result of the campaign.

38. Several international declarations, such as the Bonn Declaration of the World Mayors Council on Climate Change and recommendations from the third World Congress of United Cities and Local Governments in Mexico City, called on their member cities and partners to join the campaign and to actively support and monitor its implementation.

39. The Strategy secretariat launched the One Million Safe Schools and Hospitals pledging initiative[6] with partners from the Asian region and global International Strategy for Disaster Reduction partners. By the end of June, regional launches of the initiative took place in all regions and more than 138,000 schools and hospitals were pledged for safety. The World Health Organization (WHO) reported progress on the implementation of safer hospitals initiatives in more than 42 countries across the world. More than 630 health facilities have been assessed for their safety and ability to function in emergencies, and the measures have been implemented to reduce vulnerability and increase preparedness, in countries such as Indonesia, Mexico, Nepal, Oman, the Philippines and the Republic of Moldova.

40. The Strategy secretariat's Thematic Platform on Knowledge and Education, through a core group of partners,[7] developed a global baseline study on school safety, which was discussed at a featured event during the Global Platform. The event brought together Ministries of Education and national disaster management agencies and resulted in recommendations to make disaster risk reduction a priority in school curricula and a right for all children to achieve the global education objectives. Representatives called for more systematic and continued investment by donors in school safety. As a result, a series of school safety assessments were announced in vulnerable pilot countries.

[6] www.safe-schools-hospitals.net.

[7] UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Bank, Plan International, Save the Children, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, World Vision, the Coalition for Global School Safety (COGSS), Prevention 2000, the Strategy secretariat and others.

## C. Increasing investment in disaster risk reduction

41. Most countries reported, according to the HFA Monitor, relatively little progress towards measurable increases in resources for risk governance capacities and disaster risk management in individual sectors or for local governments. However, that is in part attributable to the complexity of recording risk reduction expenditure, as financial reporting systems do not allow easy quantification — investments are provided through diverse instruments, including sector budgeting, environmental protection funds, social solidarity and development funds, compensation funds, civil society and, in some countries, the private sector.

42. At its second session, the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (2009) suggested targets for risk-reducing investments, namely, 1 per cent of national development budgets, 10 per cent of humanitarian aid financing,[8] and 10 per cent of reconstruction and recovery funds. Measurable progress has been observed in the increasing proportion of humanitarian aid investment dedicated to disaster prevention and preparedness, as recorded in official statistics of OECD (4.2 per cent in 2009). This is an indicative figure, as with rising spending on official development assistance (ODA) — to over $132 billion in 2009[9] — and the growing emphasis on resilience within the development community, the actual figure is assumed to be much higher. But in the absence of more widespread explicit budgeting for risk reduction, a significantly greater investment is required to develop a more accurate picture.

43. Countries and communities, rich or poor, cannot afford to keep resorting to expensive post-disaster measures in the case of mostly preventable disasters. Therefore, the appreciation of the wider development community of the need to focus on resilience has grown significantly. Risk reduction and strategies for resilience feature with increasing frequency in aid effectiveness dialogue. Countries and the international community are increasingly looking to the future, and the risks that communities and countries face, when designing and implementing development programmes. Significant policy developments have been made in actively promoting risk reduction in sustainable development programming; good examples include Australia's "Integration in practice — Integrating disaster risk reduction, climate change and environmental considerations in AusAID programmes", the European Commission's Implementation Plan of the European Union (EU) Strategy for supporting disaster risk reduction in developing countries, 2011-2014 and the commitment of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to build resilience in all country programmes of the United Kingdom Department for International Development.

44. The fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, Republic of Korea, in November 2011, will provide an opportunity for Development Ministers, as well as heads of multilateral and bilateral development institutions, to make a public and measurable commitment to promote the sustainability and cost-effectiveness of poverty eradication and promote lasting peace and security, by placing resilience and risk reduction at the heart of domestic and international investment strategies.

---

[8] A target that some donors, including Australia, the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO), Germany, and the United States of America, claim to have reached or surpassed.

[9] Based on OECD/Development Assistance Committee, 2010.

45. The United Nations-World Bank partnership continues to mainstream disaster risk reduction as an integrated development priority through the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery. During 2007-2011, donors to the Facility have cumulatively pledged over $304 million for disaster risk reduction activities.

**Funding of the Strategy secretariat**

46. In line with General Assembly deliberations calling for more predictability and stability in funding for the Strategy secretariat, currently funded only through extrabudgetary resources, and taking into account the OIOS audit report on the Strategy secretariat, I have requested in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013 (see A/66/6 (Sect. 27)) the creation of a D-1 post of Chief of Branch, Regional Programme and Policy Development. This post will lead the Strategy secretariat's regional work, critical for the execution of the mandate given by the General Assembly to the Strategy secretariat, namely, to serve as the focal point in the United Nations system for the coordination of disaster reduction and to ensure synergies among the disaster reduction activities of the United Nations system and regional organizations and activities in socio-economic and humanitarian fields.

# IV. Conclusions and recommendations

47. Consultations with governments and partners through national, regional and global processes culminated with the third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, which identified[10] critical areas and opportunities for joint work to manage disaster risk and strengthen the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action over the next five years.

48. Disaster risk reduction contributes to social protection measures in support of the most vulnerable people, to economic growth and to ecosystem management. Hence, there is the need for further integrating disaster risk reduction in sustainable development and climate risk management. Disaster risk reduction and sustainable development are intrinsically linked. Ahead of the "Rio+20" World Summit on Sustainable Development, political and financial commitment to reducing disaster risk has to become a core component of our vision for sustainable development.

49. There is a clear political commitment to manage disaster risk. It is now critical to channel it through practical action. At the national level, sound decisions on development investments and planning can be supported by the establishment of key mechanisms for integrated risk mapping, disaster loss recording, integration of sectoral knowledge to better identify the causes of disasters and future mitigating measures, as well as the determination of targets for reduction.

50. National multi-stakeholder mechanisms can play a critical role in supporting informed decision-making, the development of integrated communication strategies to inform the public and thus support individuals' choices. Different models of national platforms have developed over the past 10 years with mixed results. The International Strategy for Disaster Reduction will launch a process jointly with national mechanisms to capture national experiences and ensure that a viable model

[10] See the Chair's Summary of the third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (Geneva, 8-13 May 2011).

for disaster risk reduction promotion can be established to contribute to optimal risk management.

51. Further work is required in clarifying the close link between actions for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. Strengthening the synergies between disaster prevention and climate risk reduction initiatives is an indispensable step towards reducing vulnerability. Particular attention needs to be paid to focused, applied actions targeting disaster risk reduction through climate risk management strategies.

52. From the disasters that occurred during the reporting period a number of lessons can be drawn, including:

- Public awareness, education and drills work to build resilience. Yet, little is done to increase public awareness and access to risk-management-related information. In addition, people's perception of risk changes over a period of time and thus it must be constantly reassessed to ensure a high degree of receptivity for early warning and risk information and to enable decision makers to make the right choices. Public education and access to information are instrumental to generate trust in risk management mechanisms, critical at times of crisis.

- National risk management systems must be "all-of-government" and integrated within the country and with the international systems. Indeed, gaps in institutional coordination and knowledge pose major challenges to risk management, as the crisis-managers and leaders are not properly informed about the nature and implications of the crisis they are called upon to manage.

- Safety and security information needs to be cross-referenced and combined, as well as coupled with integrated multi-hazard early warning mechanisms across systems and stakeholder groups.

- Local governments and city managers are the first institutional responders. They are also responsible for services and urban development that impact on resilience and risk. Decentralized responsibilities with accompanying capacities, resources and multi-stakeholder outreach are essential for local governments to have the means to act.

53. **In the light of the findings of the midterm review, the *2011 Global Assessment Report*, the HFA Monitor reports, and the deliberations at the third session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction, I recommend the following:**

(a) **Any future framework for sustainable development needs to include a clear prescription for incorporation of disaster and climate risk management. Equally, poverty and vulnerability reduction are integral to effective disaster risk management.**

(b) **National disaster loss registers, disaster risk mapping and financial tracking systems need to be established and further developed to effectively support future development planning and investment choices.**

(c) **Effective risk reduction takes place only with the full engagement of local governments and their communities. They need the appropriate authority,**

**and the human and financial capacity, and to be engaged in the definition of national risk management policies.**

**(d) The practice and operational models of national mechanisms for disaster risk reduction, such as multi-stakeholder national platforms, can be much better used for advocacy, knowledge and cooperation, and I encourage their further strengthening and establishment where still lacking.**

**(e) Member States and organizations need to scale up their financial, human and technology investments for disaster risk reduction, including the development of private and public sector partnerships.**

**(f) I encourage a commitment from donors and developing countries to focus more clearly on supporting local and community resilience in their programming, using creative solutions and innovations and through stronger collaboration, as part of their aid-effectiveness commitments.**

# Annex

## Specific information on progress made in implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action

1. The following section provides an overview of achievements as reported to the Strategy secretariat by national Governments,[a] United Nations agencies, the World Bank and other partners in relation to the five priority areas of the Hyogo Framework for Action.

### A. Action at the national level

**Priority 1**
**Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority**

2. Progress in this area has been consistent across the world. More than 42 countries reported substantial achievement in this priority area. Specifically, 48 countries reported substantial achievement developing national policy and legal frameworks. However, several countries also highlighted that this progress does not necessarily translate into effective disaster risk management, especially at the local level.

3. National platforms increased from 61 to 81. Among countries that established national platforms during the reporting period were: Algeria, Armenia, Canada, the Gambia, Kyrgyzstan, Panama, Paraguay, Sierra Leone and Turkey.[b] The Netherlands, Norway and Serbia are set to launch their national platforms in the coming months. The institutional arrangements for disaster risk reduction in many countries have evolved from traditional single-agency "civil protection" structures to multisector systems and platforms. However, finding appropriate institutional arrangements to ease the incorporation of disaster risk reduction into development planning and public investment remains a challenge.

4. Several countries strengthened their institutional and legislative arrangements: Myanmar, Nepal and Botswana made disaster risk management apex bodies of presidents' and vice-presidents' offices while the United Republic of Tanzania transferred that responsibility to its economic and financial planning ministries. The Governments of Chile, the Dominican Republic and Uruguay carried out reviews by impartial inter-agency experts, coordinated by the Strategy secretariat, of national institutional capacities and the status of all the priority areas in the Hyogo Framework for Action, which resulted in new legislative frameworks in Chile and Uruguay.

**Priority 2**
**Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning**

5. Progress on comprehensive risk assessments remains elusive, particularly at the local level. More than 20 countries undertook national multi-hazard risk assessments that could inform planning and development decisions. However, many countries faced major challenges linking them to development processes at the national and local levels. Unfortunately, countries that reported substantial progress

[a] Through the HFA Monitor and the *2011 Global Assessment Report*.

[b] See the following link for the complete list of national platforms: http://preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/national/list/.

in this area also highlighted an absence of national standards for assessing both disaster losses and risks. Only a few countries carried out risk assessments of schools and health facilities.

6. The European Commission adopted guidelines for mapping and assessing risks, based on a multi-hazard and multi-risk approach. Canada is developing a national all-hazards risk assessment framework. Barbados committed significant resources to conduct a comprehensive coastal risk assessment for the major coastal hazards. Several other countries made efforts to integrate risk assessments into a range of sectors, including health, education, agriculture, transportation and water management.

7. Countries reporting some progress in increasing early warning capacity include Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Lesotho, Nepal, the Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Togo and Yemen. The Government of Pakistan prepared a plan for the improvement of the integrated flood forecasting abilities and hazard mapping capacity. Haiti's warning services for coastal hazards were strengthened through technical assistance, capacity-building and training, supported by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Australia and Madagascar use mobile telephones to communicate warnings. Finland is developing digital radio networks reaching 80 per cent of its population with outdoor sirens.

**Priority 3**
**Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels**

8. This priority area continues to show limited progress. Identifying and further developing methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost-benefit analyses remains a particularly weak area. Only 19 countries rated as substantial their efforts to integrate risk reduction into school curricula and relevant formal training. The majority of countries reported significant gaps in developing public awareness strategies for vulnerable urban and rural communities. China was a notable exception, reporting comprehensive progress on the availability of risk information, on developing a countrywide public awareness strategy and integrating disaster risk reduction into school curricula.

9. Some countries in Africa, such as Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania are in the process of developing a central database for disaster risk management information. The Government of Pakistan carried out an assessment of damages and the training of teachers and provided learning opportunities for children and illiterate women affected by floods. In Haiti, over 3,000 secondary schoolteachers were trained on learner-centred psychosocial support and disaster risk reduction. Namibia made progress in introducing standards and tools for disaster risk reduction. The Ministry of Education in Myanmar initiated an effort to reduce vulnerability to disaster through an education recovery programme, targeted at female teachers.

**Priority 4**
**Reduce the underlying risk factors**

10. Progress in this area is even lower. Although countries reported a greater awareness of the need to factor disaster risk reduction into planning and investment,

only 22 rated their progress towards addressing the underlying risk drivers as substantial. Countries reported difficulties in addressing the risks internalized in different development sectors. That explains why economic loss and damage continue to increase. Only 32 countries invested in retrofitting critical public infrastructure such as schools and hospitals. Croatia reported pressure from the construction industry to lower standards and codes to reduce overall costs, even in hazard-prone areas.

11. Several countries in Africa are establishing mechanisms to protect the environment and ensure sustainable development, and many made significant efforts to incorporate disaster risk reduction in their national plans for climate change adaptation. In Uganda, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Food Programme (WFP) supported an initiative to provide a productive safety net for food-insecure pastoral and agropastoral households affected by recurrent droughts.

12. Ecuador implemented a wide range of social policy instruments as part of its disaster risk reduction strategy. Malawi's new social development policies are designed and implemented so as to reduce vulnerability of at-risk communities. In Bangladesh, WFP supported the Government and non-governmental partners to assist 30,000 food-insecure households to raise their homes above flood levels.

**Priority 5**
**Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels**

13. This area has been the dominant focus of national Governments for decades. It encompasses disaster preparedness and contingency plans at all administrative levels, financial reserves and contingency mechanisms, and well-established procedures for information exchange during emergencies. Forty-six countries reported substantial achievement in developing policy, technical and institutional capacities. It is clear that effective disaster management has contributed to the global decline in weather-related disaster mortality.

14. Various activities to reinforce national preparedness capacities were carried out by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat in a number of countries, including Albania, Colombia, Croatia, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Haiti, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Montenegro, Namibia, Oman and Turkey.

15. The Government of Ethiopia's weather risk management framework, supported by the World Bank and WFP, put in place an integrated risk management system to support the national productive safety net programme, which triggers a $160 million contingent finance pool to assist 8 million food-insecure households every year.

16. In Haiti, WFP supported the Government to prepare for disasters through standby agreements with partners and pre-positioning lifesaving supplies to be used in case of a disaster. Those efforts enabled the Government, the Programme and its partners to quickly respond to Hurricane Tomas and the cholera epidemic.

17. In West Africa, humanitarian agencies formed the Strategic Partnership for Preparedness. Capacity development activities are undertaken in-country, supported by regional and global partners. In Ghana, the emergency preparedness and response capacity assessment led to an action plan for 2011-2012.

## B. Action at the regional level

18. Regional and subregional multi-stakeholder platforms for disaster risk reduction are gradually being institutionalized and represent unique regional opportunities for stakeholders to share experiences, monitor progress and take collective action to enhance the implementation of the Hyogo Framework. The Strategy secretariat regional offices support those platforms, in partnership with United Nations agencies, the World Bank and other partners.

### Africa

19. States members of the African Union demonstrate continued commitment to disaster risk reduction through the adoption by the Executive Council of the African Union, at the January 2011 Summit, of a decision on the report of the Second African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction. The Executive Council endorsed the recommendations contained in the report, including strategic areas of action, key activities, expected results and indicators of the Extended Programme of Action for the implementation of the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (2006-2015) at continental, subregional and national levels.

20. Regional economic communities were empowered to provide effective coordination and strategic guidance to their member States to align their subregional strategies and programmes to the Africa Regional Strategy and Programme of Action and facilitate their implementation in their subregions. The work programme of the Economic Community of West African States, the Economic Community of Central African States, the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the Southern African Development Community now integrate disaster risk reduction as a priority in support of the Africa Regional Strategy and Programme of Action for Disaster Risk Reduction implementation.

21. The Inter-Governmental Authority on Development and the partner countries are working to build capacity and strengthen disaster risk reduction institutions; strengthen disaster risk management capacities of national and subregional bodies; build technical competencies and institutional capacities for disaster risk reduction and climate monitoring and prediction with financial and technical support by the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery.

### Arab States region

22. Arab nations recognize the impacts of ongoing environmental degradation, climate change, rapid unplanned urbanization, acute water scarcity, a changing demography and migration trends on achieving sustainable development goals for the region. Secondary risks associated with population displacements, disease outbreaks, pandemic influenza, food insecurity, conflict and civil unrest pose multifold challenges to the region, on a larger scale than ever before.

23. In recognition of the necessity to reduce risks associated with disaster trends in the region, the Council of Arab Ministers Responsible for the Environment adopted in December 2010 the Arab Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction 2020, subsequently endorsed by Heads of State at the second Arab Summit on Socio-Economic Development in January 2011.

24. At the national level, countries began enhancing and systematizing information systems for disasters by establishing disaster losses databases that provide needed national and local risk and vulnerability information for decision makers. Jordan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen completed their national disaster databases, while Djibouti, Egypt, Lebanon and Morocco are currently finalizing their own.

**Asia and the Pacific**

25. The Incheon Declaration of 2010 and the Incheon Regional Road Map, adopted at the fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, identified the integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation as the key priority focus area in the region until 2015. An action plan was adopted that provides comprehensive guidance to convert the Ministerial decisions and the Road Map into concrete actions at the national and local levels. Several civil society organizations and the Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies have expressed commitment to contribute to the implementation of those activities, in support of their respective Governments.

26. The 2010 Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management convened under the overarching theme "Enhancing the implementation of the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action through a multi-stakeholder approach". The Platform committed to enhance disaster risk management and climate change adaptation linkages at the national and regional level through better coordination and the development of integrated funding modalities; increase investments into disaster risk management in Pacific island countries and align investments with existing national priorities; foster mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction into national policies, budgets and all national sector plans where feasible; and share disaster risk management information and expertise through multi-stakeholder involvement, and especially the participation of communities, women and youth, politicians and parliamentarians, as well as civil society and sector experts.

**The Americas**

27. The second session of the Regional Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in the Americas took place in Nuevo Vallarta, Nayarit, Mexico, from 15 to 17 March 2011, and resulted in the Communiqué of Nayarit, a statement on concerns and proposals for a regional development agenda that explicitly and effectively includes disaster risk reduction along with considerations of adaptation to climate change.

28. The role of the subregional mechanisms, such as the Centro de Coordinación para la Prevención de los Desastres Naturales en América Central (CEPREDENAC), the Comité Andino para la Prevención y Atención de Desastres (CAPRADE), the Reunión Especializada de Reducción de Riesgos de Desastres Socionaturales, la Defensa Civil y la Asistencia Humanitaria del Mercosur (REHU) and the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency, has been catalytic in fostering the inclusion of disaster risk reduction into national policies. A remarkable example was the approval of the Central American Policy for Integral Risk Management fostered by CEPREDENAC, which introduces disaster risk reduction as a binding policy instrument for the member countries. The experience of CEPREDENAC was awarded with a mention in the Sasakawa Award 2011.

**Europe**

29. Several high-level events contributed to increasing the political commitment for disaster risk reduction at the regional and subregional levels and to the integration of disaster risk reduction as a core priority of the mandate of key European institutions such as the Council of Europe, the European Commission and the Regional Cooperation Council for South East Europe. These political processes were complemented and supported by technical exchange of information, knowledge and experience among the Hyogo Framework focal points, national platforms, and partners in the context of the European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction.

30. A medium-term plan for 2011-2015 was adopted in September 2010 at the twelfth Ministerial session of the Council of Europe European and Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement (EUR-OPA) in St. Petersburg, to "improve prevention and preparedness and promote good risk governance, use knowledge to reduce vulnerability, improve preparedness for emergencies". At the session, the Council discussed the consequences of climate change on the frequency and intensity of disasters and the measures to strengthen societies' adaptation and resilience.

31. The European Parliament adopted a resolution on the Commission Communication: "A Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters" in 2009 that welcomes the Commission's commitment to ensuring that issues related to disaster prevention are taken into account more coherently in European Union policies and programmes. The European Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction will convene its second annual meeting in Skopje in October 2011.

## C. Action at the international level

**Priority 1**
**Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority**

32. In partnership with parliaments at national, regional and global levels, disaster risk reduction was included in the agenda of several global and regional parliamentary assemblies. The Advocacy Kit "Disaster Risk Reduction: An Instrument for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals", developed by the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the Strategy secretariat, benefited parliamentarians from 124 countries.

33. The period 2010-2011 demonstrated that the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery has been able to significantly contribute towards this priority area in 13 of its 31 priority countries. To support institutional capacity and consensus-building for disaster risk reduction, the Global Facility supported 123 active projects worth over $54 million and spanning more than 50 countries as well as regional and global engagements. The joint World Bank-United Nations publication entitled *Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention* provides the economic rationale for investments in disaster prevention to underwrite political advocacy. The importance of sharing risk data to enable informed decision-making is highlighted in the report.

**Priority 2**
**Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning**

34. The Global Risk Identification Programme assists over 30 countries to build better risk information foundations for sound decision-making through various

activities, such as setting up base lines for disaster risk and incorporating risk information in decision-making processes and development programmes.

35. The UNESCO international platform on earthquake risk reduction promoted the exchange of information-based seismology and earthquake engineering. In this context, the global task force on building codes has furthered its action plan. The International Consortium on Landslides will convene the second World Landslide Forum from 3 to 9 October 2011 in Rome, under the aegis of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction.

36. The World Health Organization (WHO) supported Member States, including Afghanistan, Colombia and Mauritius, in aspects of risk assessment, such as the assessment of capacities, as a foundation for developing health emergency risk management programmes. South-east Asian countries applied a benchmarking process to assess current capacities and identify priorities for capacity development.

37. The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies published the *World Disasters Report 2010: Focus on urban risk*, which provides an in-depth look at the dramatic surge in the number of persons living in cities and towns.

38. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) supported the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction system in undertaking global risk assessments for the *2011 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*, through the development and maintenance of a web-based technical platform and source data for global risk evaluation of floods, cyclones, landslides, earthquakes, tsunamis, fires, storm surges and droughts. UNEP also developed an innovative risk assessment tool known as RiVAMP enabling policymakers to make informed decisions in support of sustainable development growth.

39. Improving disaster risk assessment and monitoring was the priority of 54 projects supported by the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery with almost $22 million invested. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO), through regional climate centres and climate outlook forums, facilitated the development of climate services that include analysis of the changing patterns of hazards and provision of seasonal to longer-time-scale forecasts and outlooks to support national disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation planning. In cooperation with United Nations-International Strategy for Disaster Reduction system partners, WMO is facilitating regional and national capacity development projects for strengthening hydrometeorological risk assessment and multi-hazard early warning systems in the Caribbean, Central America, South-east Europe and South-east Asia. In addition, WMO published a book entitled *Institutional Partnerships in Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems*, based on documentation and synthesis of seven national good practices.

40. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and its partners collaborated to strengthen the evidence base on disaster risk and children. Carried out in seven countries, the studies conclude that to ensure that the specific climate risks and vulnerabilities faced by children are addressed, a "child centred approach" to disaster risk reduction and adaptation is needed.

**Priority 3**
**Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels**

41. Support for disaster risk reduction capacity development continues to be an area of growing demand. The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI) — a partnership between the United Nations Development Programme, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs of the Secretariat and the Strategy secretariat — supported high-risk countries with capacity assessments and training.

42. While strides have been made, it is increasingly evident that needs remain, especially in strengthening the capacity of Ministries and relevant sectors to mainstream gender, including those institutions and government departments responsible for statistical collection and analysis, to collect and utilize sex-disaggregated data. The publication entitled *Making Disaster Risk Reduction Gender-Sensitive: Policy and Practical Guidelines* (2009) has been used as a reference for climate change adaptation training, benefiting more than 1,000 trainees from 107 countries.

43. The UNEP Finance Initiative works with major private insurance companies on a global initiative to integrate sustainability principles based on sound environmental management and disaster reduction criteria. UNESCO promoted disaster risk reduction as an intrinsic element of the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, especially through the integration of disaster risk reduction into national education strategies and plans.

44. In over 25 countries, WFP supported Governments to implement food security monitoring systems tracking food security, nutrition, and market indicators alongside natural hazards to provide effective analysis to support disaster preparedness, prevention and response.

45. There are measurable increases in the use and popularity of Preventionweb.net, with a 130 per cent increase in content submissions from partners and a 75 per cent increase in the number of users.

**Priority 4**
**Reduce the underlying risk factors**

46. The Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction developed a training course to build capacities of national and local governments in promoting and implementing environmental management and ecosystem-based initiatives for disaster risk reduction.

47. Together with partners, UNEP provides technical assistance that enables Governments to use environmental management tools for disaster-resilient, sustainable development planning, especially in the major ecozones vulnerable to disasters — coastal areas, mountains, river basins and drylands. Countries such as Haiti, Nepal, Peru, Sri Lanka and Uganda have benefited from such programmes. UN-Habitat supported Haiti, Chile, Colombia, Cuba and Ecuador in reducing urban risk through specific city programmes.

48. The UNDP Climate Risk Management initiative completed climate risk assessments in several countries across the world through ongoing global and regional programmes. Trainings and workshops contributed to national and local capacity-building in climate risk, impact and capacity assessment.

49. On 22 January 2011, the sixty-fourth World Health Assembly adopted a resolution (WHA64.10) in which it urged Member States, inter alia, to strengthen all-hazards health emergency and disaster risk-management programmes and develop programmes on safe hospitals. Similar resolutions were adopted in the Eastern Mediterranean and Pan American regions.

50. Disaster risk reduction and financing for sustainable development was supported by the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery in 33 projects with a total approved cost of $14.1 million. For example, a study was launched under the policy guidance of the African Union Commission to explore the feasibility of establishing new ways of funding drought-related emergency relief in Africa, with a focus on country-led, sustainable risk management strategies for the continent.

**Priority 5**
**Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels**

51. The Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) have recognized preparedness for emergency response as fundamental for rapid and effective post-disaster relief and recovery. The IASC Sub-Working Group on Preparedness is focusing efforts in support of strengthening national capacity for preparedness for emergency response in five pilot countries. The Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative is supporting these initiatives to help high-risk countries develop capacity specifically in the area of disaster preparedness with combined support from the international system. In collaboration with partners, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs undertook several initiatives, including development and revision of preparedness tools, joint planning as well as leading a task team to strengthen response preparedness at the regional level.

52. By capturing the synergies of the partners, the International Recovery Platform developed tools for recovery and provides capacity development on post-disaster recovery for national and local governments, through the guidance notes on infrastructure, shelter, health, psychosocial, climate change and adaptation, environment, gender, governance and livelihoods, as well as the post-disaster needs assessment.